Strategic Water Supply Plan Ad Hoc Committee Meeting #5 Minutes March 4, 2013 Multi-Purpose Room 12:00 Noon

Ad Hoc Committee Members: Amanda Nairn, Andy Sherrer, David Sabatini, Jim Gasaway, Judith Wilkins, Lynne Miller, Matthew Leal, Mike Pullin, Roger Frech, Sandy Bahan, Stephen Tyler Holman

Councilmembers: Mayor Rosenthal, Linda Lockett, Robert Castleberry, Roger Gallagher

Public: Jacy Crosbie, Howard Haines

Consultants: John Rehring, Amber Wooten

Staff: Ken Komiske, Mark Daniels, Charlie Thomas, Debbie Smith, Steve Lewis, Gay Webb

Introduction and Goals for Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

Mr. Komiske welcomed committee members to the 5th Ad Hoc Committee Meeting. He announced the next Strategic Water Supply Plan Public Meeting #3 will be held Wednesday, March 13th at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers. He introduced John Rehring, Carollo Project Manager and Amber Wooten, Carollo Project Engineer.

Project Update: Status and activities since January 10 Ad Hoc meeting

Mr. Rehring informed the Committee they have evaluated the six preliminary portfolios and have developed six hybrid portfolios since the January 10th Ad Hoc meeting. The goal is to have two or three preferred supply options.

Review of Supply Options and Evaluation Criteria

Mr. Rehring described the existing, new local and regional supply sources used for the portfolio development and the criteria used to evaluate the portfolios. He also explained the three-step portfolio scoring process and reviewed the service area demand projections.

Portfolio Evaluations

Ms. Wooten explained the six initial portfolios and the six hybrid portfolios developed:

Initial Portfolios

• Portfolio 1: Maximize Local Source Use - Lake Thunderbird, Additional Conservation, Non-Potable Reuse, Existing Wells (with treatment), New

Groundwater Wells to meet deficit through approximately 2020, Lake Thunderbird Augmentation for deficit post 2020

- Portfolio 2: Low Capital Cost Lake Thunderbird, Additional Conservation, Non-Potable Reuse, Existing Wells (with treatment), Oklahoma City Treated Water (wholesale)
- Portfolio 3: 100% from Oklahoma City Treated Water (co-owner)
- Portfolio 4: 100% from Oklahoma City Raw Water (co-owner)
- Portfolio 5: 100% from New Out of Basin Reservoir
- Portfolio 6: 100% from Kaw Reservoir

Hybrid Portfolios

- Portfolio 7: Lake Thunderbird, Additional Conservation, Non-Potable Reuse, Oklahoma City Treated Water (co-owner)
- Portfolio 8: Lake Thunderbird, Additional Conservation, Lake Thunderbird Augmentation, Oklahoma City (wholesale)
- Portfolio 9: Lake Thunderbird, Additional Conservation, Maximize Groundwater Use, Non-Potable Reuse
- Portfolio 10: Lake Thunderbird, Additional Conservation, Existing Groundwater Use (with treatment), Non-Potable Reuse, New Out of Basin Reservoir (Parker)
- Portfolio 11: Lake Thunderbird, Additional Conservation, Existing Groundwater Use (with treatment), Non-Potable Reuse, Oklahoma City Treated Water (coowner)
- Portfolio 12: Lake Thunderbird, Additional Conservation, New Out-of-Basin Reservoir (Scissortail)

Mr. Rehring described the weighted scoring of the initial portfolios and hybrid portfolios and noted the estimated total cost of each portfolio in present day dollars. Diversity in the portfolio will help the reliability of the portfolio.

Upcoming Public Meetings

This same information will be presented at the Public Meeting #3 which will be held Wednesday, March 13th at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

Questions asked:

What is the distinction between Oklahoma City as owner versus wholesale? Mr. Rehring explained right now, Norman buys water from Oklahoma City to meet peak demands on a wholesale basis (cost per 1000 gallons). Oklahoma City has several rates based on how much water would be used. Wholesale rates are controlled by Oklahoma City (as Oklahoma City costs go up, Norman's costs would go up). Oklahoma City as co-owner means that Norman would be a co-owner in infrastructure (responsible for own financing of capital). As owner, shared operations of pump stations and, if treated, there must be some agreement on future treatment processes and costs. Oklahoma City sources (as co-owner) are referring to a parallel pipeline to bring water from southeast Oklahoma. Norman can access as much water as needed, subject to the infrastructure portion purchased and water rights.

- O Would the price be controlled by Oklahoma City? Mr. Rehring replied if you are a wholesale customer you would pay the cost established by Oklahoma City but if you are a co-owner of the supply system you would pay some portion of debt service for a portion of the assets and a lesser amount for water usage.
- Oklahoma City needs additional water and is planning to build a pipeline parallel to their current line. Norman could choose to join this project and become a co-owner of the pipeline.
- As a co-owner, could we withdraw water whenever needed? Mr. Rehring replied it depends on how much we contribute to the project.
- Recommendation made to state "co-owner" rather than "owner" on regional supply source slide.
- o What is the estimated population in 2060? Mr. Rehring replied about 200,000.
- According to the demand projections for 2060, the average water demand could be 29 million gallons per day (mgd) and the peak demand could be 55 mgd? Mr. Rehring replied yes.
- Does the service area demand projections factor in the entire eastern boundary of Norman? Mr. Rehring explained all portfolios were designed to meet full build out of the 2025 Land Use and Transportation Plan.
- O Do we have a time limit waiting for Department of Environmental (DEQ) augmentation approval? Mr. Rehring and Mr. Komiske responded. We must prove we won't degrade the water quality. Reuse is new to Oklahoma so parameters have not been established. Staff will be meeting next week with the Oklahoma Water Resources Board (OWRB) and DEQ to discuss this matter.
- o How can DEQ hold up the augmentation approval? Mr. Komiske answered that DEQ controls permitted discharges.
- o If we augment Lake Thunderbird, how much can we get? Mr. Komiske responded this is an issue the City will have to resolve with the OWRB and DEQ and Central Oklahoma Master Conservancy District (COMCD).
- How many water customers do we have? Mr. Komiske replied approximately 32,000 bills are sent monthly. Some apartments have one meter while others have individual meters.

- There seems to be a disconnect between using Oklahoma City water and what we are reading in the paper (that Oklahoma City does not have water). Mr. Rehring responded the Oklahoma City sources under consideration for this project include paralleling the Atoka pipeline to bring Southeast Oklahoma water to the area. Oklahoma City is moving forward with this plan. Oklahoma City has been asking metro area communities how much water they need. There is a lot of permitting, financing, etc. that still needs to happen.
- o How many wells would be drilled under Portfolio 9 option? Ms. Wooten responded 80 to 90 wells, depending on yield.
- Isn't there some uncertainty with how much water the OWRB will allow us to remove? Mr. Rehring responded that OWRB is currently studying this issue and will announce a new limit in the future. We do expect a reduction from 2 acre feet per year to possibly 1 to 1.5 acre feet per year.
- o Concern expressed about drilling more wells.
- Reference made to United States Geological Survey (USGS) report of possibility of lessening the amount of arsenic from rock formations within the well. Mr. Komiske responded that USGS did a study of our wells to see if different zones or depths have higher arsenic. They found it difficult to isolate because of the makeup of the aquifer.
- O What was the result of the USGS study of pumping arsenic wells into Little River in hopes of reducing arsenic? Mr. Komiske responded the City is starting follow-up project on this aspect with the USGS. Arsenic has to go somewhere (sediment). City has another meeting with Oklahoma Water Resources Board/Department of Environmental Quality in two weeks on well discharge to Little River to determine if this is a possible pilot project.
- Will arsenic put in water help control algae on Lake Thunderbird? It is unlikely.

Action Items and Next Steps

Mr. Rehring asked for feedback from members regarding the portfolios and asked if they have suggestions of other portfolio combinations that should be evaluated. Members may call, email or provide feedback at the next public meeting. He thanked members for attending the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Items submitted for the record:

1. PowerPoint presentation entitled, Norman Utilities Authority 2060 Strategic Water Supply Plan Ad Hoc Committee Meeting #5, March 4, 2013